

Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2354) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2012, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### FREEDOM OF SPEECH

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the very notion of freedom of expression was recently on trial in the Netherlands. The popular Dutch lawmaker Geert Wilders was charged with discrimination and incitement of hatred after he made a movie depicting Islamic clerics who incite violence in the name of religion. He was prosecuted not for his actions, but for his words. That is a scary thought.

There was only one proper resolution here, and, thankfully, the court did the right thing. Wilders was acquitted of all charges. The court ruled that his statements might be offensive to Muslims, but fell within the bounds of political free debate.

Freedom of speech is a God-given right to which every person and every nation is entitled. It is no coincidence that our country's Founding Fathers deemed it so important they listed it first in the Bill of Rights. A country that refuses one's freedom of speech is doomed to grow stagnant. How can it develop as a society when it stifles or tries to punish opinion? As Wilders himself said, "Every public debate holds the prospect of enlightenment." He certainly is correct.

And that's just the way it is.

#### THE TRUTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is always an honor and a privilege to be here speaking on the House floor. It is interesting these days being a part of Congress. The media is given unfettered access to so much because we believe that people should be entitled to the truth. In fact, many libraries around the country have the line "the truth shall set you free." Of course, most people don't know where that came from. It was Jesus talking about him being the truth, and he was the truth. A lot of libraries that put that up don't realize that's what it is talking about. And I imagine there are a lot of reporters who have used that same line, and they don't know where that came from.

But what gets troubling is when reporters have access to complete transcripts, video, and they intentionally set out to deceive the public. It seems to happen a great deal. I personally

think it is one of the reasons that Fox News has just taken off so strongly, because people can see that the other cable news networks, so many of them at least, have such a slant. They don't give you the whole truth. There is nothing fair or balanced about some of the presentations. I know personally, having been on a CNN show where they cut your mike off for 4½ minutes, trash-mouth you for awhile, turn your microphone on, and then refuse to acknowledge that there is even the possibility that what you're saying is true when you know, indeed, it is true.

But this happened just here in the last week. I was on a Fox Business show, and we were talking about the money being spent by this White House and also comparing that to the Bush White House, and I had the data, absolute factual data that, for example, in the Bush White House, there were 447 total staff, and in the Obama staff there are 454 total White House staff.

□ 1330

You wouldn't think seven additional people would be that big of a deal except that nearly a fourth of the Bush White House staff—102 people, in fact—made under \$40,000; whereas, in the Obama White House, there is no paid staff member who gets less than \$40,000. So you see dramatically the difference. I was pointing out that perhaps, in the Obama White House, because of all the greatness of this White House as compared to prior White House staffs, that you deserve to be paid more because you're associated with so much more greatness in this White House.

It's interesting to see over the last 6½ years I've been in Congress that there are an awful lot of people in the mainstream media, especially in Washington, who do not understand sarcasm, who do not understand facetiousness. So, at times, it's funny to say things sarcastically, knowing that they won't get it.

But in any event, we also commented on the fact that there were all these—I think 34—czars in the Obama White House, and they're getting paid tremendous amounts of money. So Fox News had published an article, and they pointed these things out. They were talking about the interview, and they got all of the quotes accurate.

As they pointed out, it said: "The White House released its annual salary report to Congress, and like anything in Washington, it depends on who you ask if they went up too much or are an adequate reflection of the tough economic times and have moved down."

This is the writing of Kimberly Schwandt with Fox News.

Ms. Schwandt goes on to say: "The salaries, which can be seen here, show that about a third of the employees make more than \$100,000 per year and the lowest earn \$41,000, except for three people who are working for no compensation, or zero annual salary; 21 employees made the maximum of \$172,000.

"The White House backs the figures, saying that salaries went down an average of \$150 per person and that total salary spending decreased, in part, due to the total number of staffers going down as well."

Then a quote from spokesman Eric Schultz from the White House: "President Obama is deeply committed to continuing to reduce costs in government. However, some critics say they are spending too much, like Representative Louie Gohmert, Republican of Texas."

He quoted me accurately as saying: "In the White House, in looking at it, this administration's got over 450 employees. Now, under the Bush administration, there were over 100. About a fourth of the employees made less than \$40,000."

"Fox News fact-checked, and the Congressman's statements do pan out, with 102 of the 447 employees on the 2008 list having salaries of less than \$40,000."

Another quote from me, I said: "I guess, you know, there's so much greatness when you associate with this White House you deserve to be paid more. I don't know," he said.

"Gohmert added another sarcastic jab, 'Don't forget the 34—the 34 czars that are out there dictating policy, and let's face it. When you're a dictator, you need to be paid more.'"

Then it points out: "As the economy faltered, President Obama enacted a pay freeze earlier in his administration for top wage-earners. Wednesday, at a Twitter town hall, he referenced the freeze."

Of course, as we've learned from this White House and as we know from the House rules, the President never lies or misrepresents, but certainly there are many facts that are just wrong. For example, when the President ordered our troops to bomb Libya and be involved in what he called a "kinetic attack" in Libya, which was clearly military action, he said we would be there for days, not weeks or months. It has turned out it's months and maybe years unless Congress gets the Senate to go along with one of the things we passed here in the House, to cut off the spending in a country where this President is fighting for and with a group that may turn out to be worse than the bloodthirsty, mean-spirited Qadhafi has been.

In any event, there was an article written in The Hill newspaper. Again, this was fact-checked by Fox News, but it's just interesting. You hear about it all the time, the slant of the mainstream media. It's interesting because The Hill has reporters like Molly Hooper. I've never had her be anything but completely honest and truthful. She has always, that I'm aware of, been fair to me and fair in her reporting that I've seen; but this one is a person named Judy Kurtz, who just, I have to say, was dishonest. This is the story that Judy Kurtz wrote this week, July 6, in The Hill.

She quoted me as saying: “‘I guess there’s just so much greatness when you’re associated with this White House that you deserve to be paid more,’ Representative Louie Gohmert said. ‘Let’s face it. When you’re a dictator, you need to be paid more.’”

That gave the impression to people who read the article and who had picked up on it that I was saying President Obama was a dictator. In this setting, that is not what I said. The interesting point is just how clearly deceptive and dishonest Judy Kurtz was. She took two quotes. She had access to the whole video, to the whole transcript, and chose to put them together and give the wrong impression. When you do look at the full quote in context, we were talking about the czars, that there is so much greatness when you’re associated with this White House that you deserve to be paid more, but then “don’t forget the 34—the 34 czars that are out there dictating policy, and let’s face it. When you’re a dictator, you need to be paid more.”

So it is important to note there are some reporters you can trust even within the same newspaper, and there are some who can be dishonest.

During my days as a trial judge of major civil litigation and felonies, including through death penalty cases, the rule of evidence was always—and is—that credibility is always an issue. It’s always an issue. Everyone should understand that, especially reporters, who are so important to this country’s being different from any other country in the world.

So it’s hoped that more and more reporters will get back to deserving their protected status that they have under the Constitution and have a little more responsibility than Judy Kurtz did. I did appreciate Ms. Kurtz’ noting that I was being sarcastic to be sure that people like her didn’t miss it. I didn’t just leave it to chance. I pointed out verbally that I was being sarcastic, so I’m glad she got that part of the quote anyway.

□ 1340

But nonetheless, I’ve heard from people that were shocked that I called President Obama a dictator. Now they know the context.

But there are some important things going on; and with the massive overspending we’re getting, it’s important to understand who is spending money where they shouldn’t. We have just voted out the Defense appropriation bill today. There were a number of amendments that were voted on that would defund the action this President has committed us to in Libya. This President has repeatedly said that he doesn’t believe he violated the War Powers Act and doesn’t believe he needed to comply. But he certainly didn’t comply with the War Powers Act. He certainly didn’t get approval of Congress before he took such action.

Most Presidents, knowing that Congress constitutionally has the power of

the purse, have come to Congress, and the President has made his case to Congress as to why we should be involved in a theater of operation that the President wanted to commit us to. Not this President, of course. This President heard from the Arab League; he heard from apparently some in NATO and the U.N., and decided that they were more important than a consensus from Congress, not even from the Senate. The Senate is Democrat controlled. The President didn’t bother to get a vote or even approval tacitly from the Senate and here in the House, where this body, especially as a Republican majority, has steadfastly stood with the President of any party when that President committed troops to harm’s way.

In this case, there are still some in the Republican Party who have said I don’t think we ought to be in Libya; but I’m afraid if I vote to cut off funding to the action in Libya, then it may be perceived as not being supportive of the troops. Some of us who have been in the military and still talk constantly to people in the military know the common response we get from the military goes something like this: Sir, we take orders. We salute and we follow our orders. That’s what we took an oath to do. And if we’re ordered to go to Libya or anywhere else, we will salute and go. But we hope, we pray that somebody in Washington will use some good sense so that when we lay down our lives in the call of duty from Washington that it will not be in vain. Please take action to make sure that when we lay down our lives, it’s not wasted.

And for this administration and some in Congress, certainly not a majority, to think it’s a good idea to go into Libya and to get our services involved in an action which Secretary of Defense Gates said we have no national security interest in that action—it’s not a good idea—and when we find out factually that there are al Qaeda, a group with whom we are at war, and when there are Muslim Brotherhood, who believe in violence, involved in the rebel action against an evil Qadhafi, then wisdom would indicate you should find out if the person that is going to be replaced by your bombs and your military or kinetic action—you have an obligation to find out—is going to be worse than the person you’re replacing.

And we don’t know that. In fact, the indications are whoever replaces Qadhafi in this current rebel group will likely be a tremendous enemy of Israel, a significant enemy of the United States. It may be a situation in which the people that replace an intolerant leader like Qadhafi may be worse than Qadhafi, just as we saw happen in Iran back when Jimmy Carter was President.

As I recall, I believe Jimmy Carter welcomed the Ayatollah Khomeini back as a man of peace. Well, Khomeini’s idea of peace was a whole lot

different than most of ours and certainly the party’s in Congress that’s in the majority, because Khomeini’s idea of peace was a world in which there is a world-wide caliphate and one great Muslim leader dictates what peace means. He dictates shari’a law for everyone. There is no freedom of worship for Christians, for Buddhists—certainly not for Jewish people of orthodox faith, absolutely not. In fact, they’re obviously infidels from the things that were written and the things that can only be written and spoken in the Middle East.

In Egypt, Mubarak was a problem, but Mubarak had seen the handwriting on the wall. And he was moving toward some local elections and could see he needed to move toward the idea of democracy, but didn’t want to give up power. Mubarak, for all his flaws, at least was not an active belligerent against Israel. Qadhafi we knew had blood on his hands, but we also saw from Ronald Reagan dropping bombs down his smokestack back, I believe in ’86—and then again when the United States moved into Iraq we saw it again—Qadhafi was afraid of us. And perhaps it’s better to have a leader who is afraid of you in power than people who are religious fanatics who have sworn that their goal in life is to bring your country down.

One of the important things—and to me, I think it’s the most important job, Mr. Speaker, here in Congress—is to provide for the common defense. We heard the President down at the border not long ago say he has committed more Federal troops to our border than any President ever—more people down there to protect our border anyway. Actually, he probably didn’t have enough history training to know that in 1916 President Woodrow Wilson—I’m not a big fan of President Wilson’s, but nonetheless, after a man named Pancho Villa was responsible for coming across into the United States and killing some Americans, Wilson committed General Pershing to go—my recollection is it was around 14,000 troops that went into Mexico. Because Pancho Villa had come across our sovereign border and killed people, then it was deemed to be appropriate to chase him down wherever he might go because that individual, with his cronies, had declared war on us and taken war-like action.

And there was also a group, a new group basically, the National Guard, that was called up. One account I read said over 100,000 National Guard soldiers were called to our southern border to ensure that no one came across and killed Americans again.

Now, I know that President Bush committed National Guard troops. I was very disappointed that the troops were not put on the border. They were put miles back, and they were given rules of engagement that said, in essence, if you see some armed group coming from across the border, then you are to report it and then flee the

area. Well, that's not what should have been done, and I can assure what's being done today is not what should be done, where we take more action to go against the States that are trying to defend themselves than we do to try to defend the States themselves.

□ 1350

But we are at a crucial time in this country's history. Admiral Mullen said the national debt is the biggest threat to our security. But take your pick. Whether it's a nation like Iran that is led by a religious zealot who may be crazy—but he's not stupid—they've got people working toward, around the clock, moving toward having nuclear weaponry. They already have at least one bomb. And even though our friends down in the majority in the Senate, even though in this White House so many say, "Oh, no. We just need to step up sanctions and all will be well. We'll bring them into line," Iran knows that once they've got enough in the way of nuclear weaponry that they'll be able to extort countries into removing any type of sanctions.

People in Israel are well aware, most of them—certainly Prime Minister Netanyahu is—that when Iran has adequate nuclear weaponry, they'll be a threat to Israel. They'll be a threat to freedom. They'll be a threat to liberty around the world because they will be able to take blackmail or extorted action to get countries to either do as they say or a nuclear weapon will be going off in that country.

They're working on the missiles. They'll be able to carry those nuclear weapons to places like the United States. Even now, it wouldn't take a missile to put a nuclear weapon on a boat, a yacht, to bring it into one of our harbors. And let's face it. We saw our vulnerability on 9/11, many of us, even though I was a judge at the time. We said we can never let ourselves be that vulnerable again. And here we are, nearly 10 full years later, and we're allowing a madman, a religious zealot in Iran, to develop nuclear weapons. Sanctions haven't worked. They're not working. The centrifuges are still turning. They're still developing nuclear weaponry.

We've got these type of threats in the world, and instead of standing firm as Ronald Reagan did, which led to bringing down the Iron Curtain, this administration has chosen to placate our enemies and turn against many of our allies.

That was further brought home to me when I traveled with DANA ROHR-ABACHER and a couple of other Members of Congress. There were warlords from the Northern Alliance of Afghanistan that wanted to meet with us because we were told that the administration didn't want to meet with them. And after we met with them, it was clear why the administration wouldn't want to.

Now, I was not aware—and it was during the Bush administration of

course, our initial actions in Afghanistan—we sent in intelligence. We sent in special forces. We sent in weaponry. We equipped the Northern Alliance tribes who had a special personal interest in defeating the Taliban. Afghanistan, as a whole, had seen how evil the Taliban was, how much damage they could do to society as they burned paintings and books and films and totally suppressed freedom in Afghanistan. Well, they knew. These people are evil, but they were afraid of them. But with the United States weaponry, with our guidance, intelligence, training, these people defeated the Taliban.

What I was not aware of until we met with these folks—and it turns out I could have been aware. I just was not. But you do the research. You'll find out. The Bush administration convinced the Northern Alliance, Okay. Now that you've whipped the Taliban, you need to totally disarm, because we're the United States, and we're here, and we'll make sure nothing happens to you again.

Well, the Northern Alliance messed up because they trusted us, and they turned in their weapons. I asked one, You turned in all your weapons? Well, apparently, they have some small arms but nothing that would allow them to take on the Taliban again. Naturally, these people were concerned, because they know because they fought for and with the United States against the Taliban that, if the Taliban is allowed to overtly exist in Afghanistan, then these people that fought for us and with us will all be killed as will all their family members.

They were and are our allies. They fought for us. They defeated the Taliban, and now we're on the verge of leaving these people disarmed, vulnerable, and to be killed by the very people we went into Afghanistan after. It doesn't have to be this way. It doesn't have to be this way at all.

I mean, we can learn from the past. Rearm the Northern Alliance. We perceive the arrogance, the condescension not only from Prime Minister Maliki in Iraq but certainly from the leader in Afghanistan, Karzai, certainly from his brother. There's just too much arrogance there. All kinds of stories about corruption. But whether or not you believe that, it's clear that the Taliban is being allowed to do things now in Afghanistan that we were supposed to have eliminated by our coming in.

It may well be, as one Afghan told me, that once we begin, if we would, to rearm the Northern Alliance, Karzai might be a lot more cooperative than he has been.

But nonetheless, a year ago, we were being told, Your administration in Washington, the Obama administration, is indirectly talking, negotiating with the Taliban to just let the United States out without any big incidents, and then they can have whatever they take. And that's when they pointed out, You can't let this happen. You can't do this to your allies.

Well, we've already seen it with Israel. We voted with Israel's enemies in May of last year, I believe it was, to demand that Israel disclose all of their weaponry, their nuclear weaponry. It's the first time the United States had joined forces with Israel's enemies, and it was one of the reasons that shortly after that that we saw the flotilla come from Turkey down to challenge the Israeli blockade. That was a blockade for one thing: weapons. Prevent weapons from going into the Gaza Strip. The rockets were coming every day. Israelis had been killed. There was no reason to allow those weapons to come into the Gaza Strip. It was a legitimate blockade. It came after we showed distance between our great ally Israel and this country.

That also came on the heels of the President snubbing Prime Minister Netanyahu. And of course Prime Minister Netanyahu has not spoken of this that I've ever heard or read, but certainly others noted how badly he was snubbed by the President just blowing him off where normally you would have a meal, saying, Good luck on your own, and when you get ready to accept what I told you to do, then send me a note and I'll come back and see you. But anyway, we have not been allies as we should be to Israel.

But it was after that when I started pushing to try to get Prime Minister Netanyahu, the leader of Israel, to be invited in this room. Speaker PELOSI, when I broached the subject with her, thought it was a good idea, but she didn't feel there was adequate time. And I brought it up in June, between then and the end of the year, to work him in.

□ 1400

Obviously, we did have to name a lot of courthouses and had athletic teams to congratulate, so we weren't able to get to that. But Speaker BOEHNER, to his credit, did extend the invitation. Prime Minister Netanyahu did an incredible job. With the ideas he put forth, he did an incredible job, from the second level here, of addressing this body and addressing the world from here in Congress.

What I had hoped for came to pass. The world got an incredible visual image of the fact that this body, both sides of the aisle, that can't hardly agree on much of anything, over and over—I am told 26 times—stood to applaud the leader of Israel, showing the world that we are united in our support of our friend Israel from Congress, regardless of what the house down Pennsylvania Avenue does the rest of the time. Congress controls the purse strings, and Congress is a friend of Israel and vice versa.

So it is important, in order to provide for the common defense of this country, that we make sure that our allies know, if you're our friend, then we stand by you. If you're our enemy, then we will do as President Kennedy pointed out, as President Bush pointed

out: We will seek you wherever you are, and we will eliminate you as an enemy. By doing that, you can have peace in the world.

There is a sign that emerges from time to time. People carry it around. I've seen it up here. I've seen it in New York: "War never brought about peace." It says a great deal about the history teachers that an individual that would carry that kind of sign must have had because the only time you have peace for an extended period is when a big-hearted country does take on evil that has grown too big and becomes a threat to people's liberty and freedom and defeats that evil. Then you have a period of peace.

And the only way it becomes an extended peace is when a country is strong enough, or countries are strong enough, that the world knows if you become a threat to our liberty, our freedom, then we will eliminate you as a threat to freedom.

Now, again, there are those who believe shari'a law talks of freedom and peace, but that's a freedom and peace as dictated by the ultimate leader of the group. That also brings me back to the issue of the Muslim Brotherhood. This administration has given the indication that they think it is a group of peace. You can go on Wikipedia, and the proponents of the Muslim Brotherhood have done an excellent job of cleaning up the history that shows them to be supporters of terrorism and the numerous ties linking them to terrorism in the world.

They've also done a good job of making this administration believe that they're peaceful and loving to the point that, as Denis McDonough, the number two person in our national security agency or administration, thanked President Magid, Imam Magid, the president of the Islamic Society of North America, for the wonderful prayer he gave inside the White House in the celebration of Iftar last year, the end of Ramadan, that President Obama had.

The Islamic Society of North America, ISNA, is a named co-conspirator—was—in the Holy Land Foundation trials in which the first five defendants were found guilty of 108 counts of supporting terrorism. And when some tried to have their names stricken because they were not indicted in that first action, the judge, in essence, ruled there has been a *prima facie* case here showing that they are linked and supportive of terrorism; we're not eliminating their names.

So it was shocking to some of us when the Holder Justice Department dropped the cases against the named coconspirators and refused to go forward with them. This notebook has some of the materials, and there are plenty of them, as anybody can see. This is a thimbleful compared to what is there. You want checks from the Islamic Centers' co-op funds? You want deposit slips? You want ledgers? The FBI's gathered all this stuff. There are

great cases against these groups that the Holder Justice Department decided not to pursue.

And when we had Attorney General Holder in front of our Judiciary Committee and he was asked about dropping it, he acted like and basically stated he had nothing to do with it, that that was somebody down in Texas, an attorney down there, and he could get us a copy of the Dallas Morning News article where the U.S. Attorney—actually, it was acting U.S. Attorney—had made that statement that politics played no role.

Well, certainly politics played a role, and that became very obvious. And the more we find, the more it appears the Attorney General is not honest about perhaps the reason that these were not pursued. But until we find out the actual reasons for these being dropped, we will not know how honest or dishonest the situation with this Attorney General is.

I know that Chairman ISSA is pursuing the Fast and Furious investigation. But on this one, we could put this whole matter to bed very quickly if the Attorney General will just produce the memorandum that Chairman PETE KING and Chairman LAMAR SMITH have requested from the Justice Department. If he will just come forward, produce that memo, not black it out, then we can find for sure the documentation of whether or not what the Attorney General had said in testifying before Congress was true or not.

Now, it was interesting to find that the FBI had a special relationship, a special partnership, with CAIR, another of the named coconspirators in the Holy Land Foundation trial. And it was rather shocking to me that it was not until 2009 that the FBI decided to end their special relationship with this named co-conspirator in the Holy Land Foundation case. Apparently, the FBI had had a special relationship with CAIR for years, even though the FBI began to gather these materials back as early as 1993 and had solid proof for a number of years that they were involved in supporting Hamas with terrorism.

And yet nothing was done until 2009, when a letter was sent, saying, because of the evidence that was introduced some months back regarding CAIR and their relationships with terrorism, we think it's appropriate to suspend our relationship for now.

Now, I realize that there are people in the media, as we saw this one reporter from The Hill that will not give adequate coverage, who will take quotes out of context in order to misrepresent or give people a false impression. But if this is adequately looked at, people will find the truth: that we have people who have been associated with the support of terrorism coming to the White House—one who was president of a group, who certainly from the documentation appears to have supported terrorism, leading the White House in prayer.

□ 1410

And then we find out that when the President was giving a speech at the State Department, in the State Department—security was very, very tight; it was difficult to get in without going through all the checking, the bag checking, the metal detectors and all the different things you had to go through to make sure security was tight—apparently the White House invited Imam Majid, the president of the Islamic Society of North America, a named coconspirator for supporting terrorism. It invited him into the inner sanctum of the State Department to listen to the President's speech and give comments about what he thought about the speech.

At some point, this administration is going to have to get around to the point where providing for the common defense means you get tough with people who associate with groups that support terrorism. You don't do, as Senator Obama said, just go talk to terrorists because you're so, apparently, warm and friendly. Really, the President, having met with him, he is a charming man. He comes across as bright, engaging. You want to like him. Apparently that's worked so well, he must think that he can convince religious extremists that we're good folks, so you can just get along with them. The problem is, when you're dealing with people who want to destroy your way of life, there's only one way to deal with them.

We've seen this from the attacks in the early days of our country's existence from Islamic zealots in North Africa who captured our ships, took prisoners—the men on those ships—held them for ransom, used some as slaves, were willing to kill or enslave others, and I read at one point, and it's hard to believe that this is true—hopefully it's not—but that at one point we may have paid as much as 18 percent of the country's budget back in the late 1790s for getting our sailors back from the Barbary pirates, these Islamic extremists.

Thomas Jefferson, who had been sent at one point as one of the diplomats to negotiate with the Muslim extremists, was taken aback when he asked, Why would you attack American ships? We're no threat to you. We don't have a powerful Navy. We've never attacked you—and reportedly was told that we in our religion believe we go to paradise if we were to die while attacking infidels like you. Jefferson was shocked. He was an extremely well-read person. He found it hard to believe there was a religion anywhere that any believer of that religion perceived that you could go to a paradise by killing innocent people. So he got his own English translation of the Koran, that can still be found in the Library of Congress, so he could read for himself. Some of the passages are subject to interpretation and certainly have been interpreted by some as meaning the only way to proceed is to attempt to

take out infidels like those of us who are Christians, those who are Jewish, because we are certainly considered infidels in their eyes. Thank goodness not all Muslims believe that that has to be what occurs, but that is certainly what some believe.

I might read a passage from the judge's decision from July 1, 2009, in response to the effort by the named co-conspirators, some of them to have names stricken who were not actually indicted in the first trial. The judge, having reviewed acting U.S. Attorney Jacks's memos, said this:

"The government has produced ample evidence to establish the associations of CAIR, ISNA and NAIT with the Holy Land Foundation, HLF, the Islamic Association for Palestine and with Hamas. While the court recognizes that the evidence produced by the government largely predates the Holy Land Foundation designation date, the evidence is nonetheless sufficient to show the association of these entities with HLF, IAP, and Hamas."

The judge said:

"Thus maintaining the names of the entities on the list is appropriate in light of the evidence proffered by the government."

It is important to note that CAIR, with whom our Justice Department had a special relationship until on into 2009, and ISNA, that the evidence has certainly been produced by the government shows, as the judge says, ample evidence to establish the associations with these groups with the Holy Land Foundation, the group that was convicted, as well as Hamas, and yet this administration continues, I guess, to think that their winning personalities, charming as they are, will bring people around, and so they trust them to come into the inner sanctum of the White House, the State Department, the Justice Department. All that means is, we're in big trouble.

There are those over the years that have believed that our answers would come from prayer. Virtually every President, I guess every President, has indicated such that this Nation is best protected when it prays. That is why you would have such an amazing minister as Peter Marshall, as Chaplain in the United States Senate back in the 1940s, and this book that I have referenced previously is really profound, and I would, Mr. Speaker, like to finish up reading a couple of prayers that have been prayed in the United States Senate in the 1940s by U.S. Senate Chaplain Peter Marshall.

One prayer says:

"Forgive us, Lord Jesus, for doing the things that make us uncomfortable and guilty when we pray.

"We say that we believe in God, and yet we doubt God's promises.

"We say that in God we trust," which can be found right up above the Speaker's head, "yet we worry and try to manage our own affairs.

"We say that we love Thee, O Lord, and yet do not obey Thee.

"We believe that Thou hast the answers to all our problems, and yet we do not consult Thee.

"Forgive us, Lord, for our lack of faith and the willful pride that ignores the way, the truth, and the life.

"Wilt Thou reach down and change the gears within us that we may go forward with Thee. Amen."

That was one of Peter Marshall's prayers as Chaplain of the Senate in the 1940s.

□ 1420

I conclude with this prayer by Peter Marshall in the 1940s: "O Lord our God, even at this moment as we come blundering into Thy presence and prayer, we are haunted by memories of duties unperformed, promptings disobeyed, and beckonings ignored.

"Opportunities to be kind knocked on the door of our hearts and went weeping away.

"We are ashamed, O Lord, and tired of failure.

"If Thou art growing close to us now, come nearer still, till selfishness is burned out within us and our wills lose their weakness in union with Thine own.

"Amen."

It is important to note: Prayers for the individuals to adhere to, as George Washington said, have a humble imitation of the designer of our blessed religion. As Washington said, those are for individuals.

We get questions on, Well, how can you be a Christian and not want to give away all the government money to the poor and the needy? How can you be a Christian and not want to give away the government money to do all these other things and to end a Defense Department? have no soldiers? just be people of peace?

And I know that in this great country we have got virtually every religion being practiced that's known to man; but in the Christian religion, for those that believe the New Testament means what it says, Romans 13 is very clear. The government exists as God's minister so that they encourage good. Romans 13:4 says, but if you do evil be afraid. God does not give the government the sword in vain. It does say "sword," and that is the purpose of government.

We took an oath to follow the Constitution. We are supposed to provide for the common defense. We are supposed to have an Army, a military, that protects this Nation so that people can practice the religion of their choice. Whether it's Islam peaceably, Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, the human secularism that seems to have often overtaken Washington, you have the freedom to do that.

But the government's role is to protect the country, protect the people, keep people from coming in through our borders that want to harm us so that individuals can give from the blessings of their heart to help the needy, to help the poor, to help others.

You cannot find one reference in the New Testament that says government is to go about using and abusing its taxing authority, legalize stealing from people who have earned the money so that we can give it away to Congress' favorite charity or a government's favorite charity. The government is to provide protection, protect against evil, encourage good, and create an environment where good people can do good.

[From Fox News, July 7, 2011]

ONLY IN WASHINGTON: WHITE HOUSE SALARIES HAVE GONE BOTH UP AND DOWN

(By Kimberly Schwandt)

The White House released its annual salary report to Congress and like anything in Washington, it depends on who you ask if they went up too much, or are an adequate reflection of the tough economic times and have moved down.

The salaries, which can be seen here show that about a third of the employees make more than \$100,000 per year and the lowest earn \$41,000, except for three people who are working for no compensation, or \$0 annual salary. Twenty-one employees made the maximum \$172,000.

The White House backs the figures, saying that salaries went down an average of \$150 per person and that total salary spending decreased in part due to the total number of staffers going down as well.

"President Obama is deeply committed to continuing to reduce costs in government," said White House Spokesman Eric Schultz.

However, some critics say they are spending too much, like Rep. Louie Gohmert, R-Texas.

"[I]n the White House, in looking at it, this administration's got over 450 employees. Now, under the Bush administration, there were over 100, about a fourth of the employees, made less than \$40,000," he told Fox Business on Tuesday.

Fox News fact-checked, and the congressman's statements do pan out, with 102 of the 447 employees on the 2008 list having salaries of less than \$40,000.

"I guess, you know, there's so much greatness when you associate with this White House you deserve to be paid more, I don't know," he said.

Gohmert added another sarcastic jab, "Don't forget the 34—the 34 czars that are out there dictating policy and let's face it . . . when you're a dictator you need to be paid more."

As the economy faltered, President Obama enacted a pay freeze earlier in his administration for top wage-earners.

Wednesday at a Twitter town hall, he referenced the freeze.

"So they haven't had a raise in two and a half years, and that's appropriate, because a lot of ordinary folks out there haven't, either. In fact, they've seen their pay cut in some cases," Obama said.

An analysis by the gossip website Gawker, that was widely circulated and posted on the Internet, compared the salary increases to those of what staffers got last year. The site found that 75 percent of staffers who stayed on got raises from 2009 to 2010.

And this year, the figure isn't quite as big—but of 270 staffers who have been at the White House for more than a year, more than 50 percent got raises with an average increase of 8 percent.

Fox double-checked Gawker's claim on how many got raises and found 267 staffers on both lists, indicating they had worked for more than one year. Of those staffers, 144 had received a raise in 2011 (54%).

It's worth noting that some of those raises were for promotions, not just for the regular yearly increases.

"To be clear, in the past year, the average salary of a White House employee went down, the total number of White House staffers went down, and the total amount spent on White House salaries went down. If pay increases were issued, they were given for a variety of reasons, ranging from promotions to additional work responsibilities," Schultz said.

Most employee survey data, like these by The Conference Project, projected about 3 percent raises on average for employees nationwide this year.

The White House is of course a different entity than the private sector so it's hard to exactly do an apples to apples comparison.

[From the Hill, July 6, 2011]

REPUBLICAN MOCKS WHITE HOUSE SALARIES  
(By Judy Kurtz)

A Republican congressman on Wednesday criticized the White House for paying staffers too much in salary.

"I guess there's just so much greatness when you're associated with this White House that you deserve to be paid more," Rep. Louie Gohmert (R-Texas) said. "Let's face it, when you're a dictator, you need to be paid more."

Gohmert made clear his remark was meant to be sarcastic. However, he criticized the White House for paying 141 aides more than \$100,000 per year. A report from the White House released Friday listed the salaries of 454 employees and showed that no staffer is paid less than \$40,000.

"It sounds like the only thing that's truly shovel-ready is all the bull that they've been feeding to us over the last two and a half years," Gohmert said on the Fox News Business channel. "That needs to be shoveled out in a hurry."

Gohmert also slammed a White House stimulus report released last Friday that asserted the stimulus created as many as 3.6 million jobs in the first quarter of 2011.

"Who would ever dream that paying people \$175,000 in the White House would be a bargain compared to how much they're paying to create private sector jobs," Gohmert said. "[President Obama] has squandered so much money that you've heard the sucking sound coming from the private sector."

Republicans claim the stimulus paid out \$278,000 for every job it created. The White House called that a "false analysis."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAMPBELL (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of attending, in his role as cochairman of the Congressional United Kingdom Caucus, a working reception in his home State of California, in honor of their Royal Highnesses, The Duke and Duchess of Cambridge.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 11, 2011, at noon for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2338. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Washington; Modification of the Rules and Regulations [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-11-0024; FV11-946-31R] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2339. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sorghum Promotion, Research and Information Program; State Referendum Results [AMS-LS-11-0040] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2340. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2011-2012 Marketing Year [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-10-0094; FV11-985-1 FR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2341. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States Standards for Grades of Potatoes [Doc. #: AMS-FV-08-0023] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2342. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Organic Program; Amendment to the National List of Allowed and Prohibited Substances (Livestock) [Document Number: AMS-NOP-10-005; NOP-10-04FR] (RIN: 0581-AD04) received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2343. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Softwood Lumber Research, Promotion, Consumer Education and Industry Information Order [Document Number: AMS-FV-10-0015; PR-A2] (RIN: 0581-AD03) received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2344. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fresh Prunes Grown in Designated Counties in Washington and in Umatilla County, OR; Termination of Marketing Order 924 [Docket No.: AMS-FV-10-0053; FV10-924-1 FR] received June 13, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2345. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2346. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2347. A letter from the Deputy to the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Securities of Nonmember Insured Banks (RIN: 3064-AD67) received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2348. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, trans-

mitting the third annual report on the Prevention and Reduction of Underage Drinking; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2349. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the former Librarian regime of Charles Taylor that was declared in Executive Order 13348 of July 22, 2004, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2350. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting extension of the waiver of Section 907 of the FREEDOM Support Act, Pub. L. 107-511, with respect to assistance to the Government of Azerbaijan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2351. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the forty-fourth Semiannual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-Up, covering the six month period ending March 31, 2011 in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2352. A letter from the President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank Topeka, transmitting the 2010 Statements on System of Internal Controls of the Federal Home Loan Bank of Topeka, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2353. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — West Virginia Regulatory Program [WV-117-FOR; OSM-2011-0006] received June 24, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2354. A letter from the Assistant Secretary — Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2010 Report to Congress on the Contract Support Costs of Self-Determination Awards; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2355. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Red Snapper Management Measures [Docket No.: 101124579-1236-02] (RIN: 0648-BA51) received June 1, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2356. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers from the Chapman Valve Manufacturing Company (i.e., Building 23 and the Dean Street facility) in Indian Orchard, Massachusetts to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2357. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition on behalf of workers from the Bliss & Laughlin Steel Company located at 110 Hopkins Street, Buffalo, New York to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort (SEC), pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 (EEOICPA); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2358. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, trans-